UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/083,814	02/27/2002	Joseph Francis Mann	01AB162	6548

63122 7590 04/16/2007

ROCKWELL AUTOMATION, INC./BF
ATTENTION: SUSAN M. DONAHUE, E-7F19
1201 SOUTH SECOND STREET
MILWAUKEE, WI 53204

EXAMINER	
CHEN, TSE W	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
2116	

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
3 MONTHS	04/16/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/083,814	MANN ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Tse Chen	2116	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *07 February 2007*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-23* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-23* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on February 7, 2007 has been entered.

Claim Objections

2. Claim 1, 3-5, 7-10 is objected to because of the following informalities:

- As to claim 1, "a bootstrap program executable by the processing unit" should be removed as the integrated processor system requires a bootstrap memory [i.e., claim 23] to contain the bootstrap program.
- As to claims 1 and 12, "selected set up data" should be "determined set up data".
- As to claims 1, 3-5, 7-10, "external memory" should be "external random access memory".
- As to claim 5, "wherein the external memory includes non-volatile memory and volatile memory and wherein the processing unit executes at least a portion of the bootstrap program to provide for the acquisition of the external memory setup data for the external volatile memory from the external non-volatile memory" should be "wherein the processing unit executes at least a portion of the bootstrap program to provide for the acquisition of the external random access memory setup data for the external random access memory from an external non-volatile memory".

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

3. Claims 1-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. Applicant did not disclose the subject matter of "a common integrated circuit substrate without general-purpose random access memory" in the original specification [i.e., cache 24 and buffer 36 in fig.2 are considered to be RAM]. In order to apply prior art, Examiner will take the position that the common integrated circuit substrate ***does*** have general-purpose random access memory [e.g., caches].

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

5. Claims 1, 3-6, 10-12, 14-16, 20-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Fullam et al., US Patent 5802550, hereinafter Fullam.

6. In re claim 1, Fullam discloses an integrated processor system [fig.3] comprising:

- A common integrated circuit substrate [col.6, ll.60-63] holding each of:
    - A processing unit for performing arithmetic and logical operations [52].

- At least one internal system storage structure selected from the group consisting of caches [25, 27; col.6, l.59], buffers, and registers [54].
- An external memory interface [col.6, ll.55-57] for connecting to an external random access memory [58] not on the common substrate [col.1, ll.33-34; slow speed RAM as peripheral memory device 58].

- Wherein the processing unit [52]:
  - (i) Executes at least a portion of a bootstrap program [boot process] to determine memory setup data [e.g., speed configuration data associated with different external memory] needed to communicate with external random access memory while using the at least one internal system storage structure for temporary storage required for execution of the bootstrap program without write access to external random access memory for storage of data necessary for the execution of the bootstrap program [fig.1b; col.3, l.2 – col.4, l.1; bidirectional caches used for execution without need to write to external memory].
  - (ii) Only after the execution of (i) connects to the external memory using the determined set up data for the reading and writing to the external memory [col.4, ll.19-21; col.7, l.27 – col.8, l.6; e.g., high speed data with particular cycles related to wait time would not work with "slow" external memory].

7. In re claim 12, Fullam discloses, a method of initializing an integrated processor system including on the common integrated circuit substrate [col.6, ll.60-63], a processing unit for performing arithmetic and logical operations [52]; at least one internal system storage structure selected from the group consisting of: caches [25, 27; col.6, l.59], buffers, and registers [54]; and

an external memory interface [col.6, ll.55-57] for connecting to an external general purpose random access memory not on the common substrate [col.1, ll.33-34; slow speed RAM as peripheral memory device 58] comprising the step of:

- Executing at least a portion of a bootstrap program [boot process] by the processing unit to determine memory set-up data [e.g., speed configuration data associated with different external memory] needed to communicate with different type of external memory while using the at least one internal system storage structure for temporary storage needed for the execution of the bootstrap program without access to external memory for storage of data needed for the execution of the bootstrap program [caches used for execution] [col.3, l.2 – col.4, l.1; col.7, ll.51-53].
- Only after determination of the memory set-up data, connecting to the external memory using the determined set up data for the reading and writing to the external memory [col.7, l.27 – col.8, l.6; e.g., high speed data with particular cycles related to wait time would not work with "slow" external memory].

8. As to claims 3 and 14, Fullam discloses a memory interface [56] for communicating with external memory [58] and wherein the processing unit [52] executes at least a portion of the bootstrap program [boot process] to provide for the acquisition of external memory setup data [default from 54] required for the memory interface to initiate communication with external memory [col.7, ll.39-50].

9. As to claims 4 and 15, Fullam discloses, a network interface and wherein the processing unit executes at least a portion of the bootstrap program to provide for the acquisition of the

external memory setup data through a network connection [col.7, ll.39-50; configuration data stored in external 64 accessed through network].

10. As to claims 5 and 16, Fullam discloses, wherein the external memory includes non-volatile memory [64] and volatile memory [58] and wherein the processing unit executes at least a portion of the bootstrap program to provide for the acquisition of the external memory setup data for the external volatile memory from the external non-volatile memory [col.3, ll.59-63; col.7, ll.39-50].

11. As to claim 6, Fullam discloses, comprising wherein the external non-volatile memory is flash memory [col.7, ll.41-42].

12. As to claims 10 and 20, Fullam discloses, wherein the processing unit further executes at least a portion of the bootstrap program to store the memory setup data in the memory interface [54 part of 56] and then to execute a program contained in external memory [col.1, ll.25-50; col.7, l.38 – col.8, l.19].

13. As to claims 11 and 21, Fullam discloses, wherein the memory setup data is selected from the group consisting of: memory type as static or dynamic, memory speed, memory size, memory parity, and memory timing [col.3, ll.47-58; col.7, ll.11-26; col.9, ll.5-7].

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

14. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

15. Claims 2, 13, 22-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fullam as applied to claims 1 and 12 above, and further in view of Gupta, US Patent 6577158.

16. Fullam taught each and every limitation as discussed above. Fullam did not disclose explicitly communicating electrical signals with non-memory external devices and did not disclose explicitly the bootstrap program is stored in a bootstrap memory also on the common integrated circuit substrate.

17. In re claims 2 and 13, Gupta discloses interface circuits [e.g., 120] for communicating electrical signals [e.g., video signals] with non-memory external devices [e.g., DVD player] [col.5, ll.2-15].

18. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Fullam and Gupta before him at the time the invention was made, to modify the integrated processor system taught by Fullam to include the well known teachings of Gupta, as the use of non-memory external devices is very well known and suitable for use with the integrated circuit of Fullam. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to make such a combination as it provides a well known way to expand an integrated circuit's peripheral functions.

19. In re claims 22 and 23, Gupta discloses an integrated processor system [fig.1] wherein the bootstrap [startup] program is stored in a bootstrap memory [140] also on the common integrated circuit substrate [105] [col.5, ll.20-31].

20. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Fullam and Gupta before him at the time the invention was made, to modify the integrated processor system taught by Fullam to include the teachings of Gupta, in order to obtain the

claimed integrated processor system. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to make such a combination as it reduces the size and power consumption as well as manufacturing costs [Gupta: col.1, ll.27-38].

21. Claims 8 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fullam as applied to claims 1 and 12 above, and further in view of Devereux, US Patent 6671779.

22. In re claims 8 and 18, Fullam taught each and every limitation as discussed above. Fullam discloses the integrated processor system wherein the system storage structure is a cache memory [54] and wherein the processing unit executes at least a portion of the bootstrap program to read arbitrary data into the cache memory [col.7, ll.39-50]. Fullam did not disclose locking the cache memory against further reading or writing to external memory.

23. Devereux discloses an integrated processor system [fig.3] wherein the system storage structure is a cache memory [30'] and wherein the processing unit [10] executes at least a portion of the bootstrap program to read arbitrary data [data values for interrupts] into the cache memory and then to lock the cache memory against further reading or writing to external memory [80] so that it may be used as variable storage for further execution of the bootstrap program [col.7, ll.36-49; external memory capable of being used as variable storage for execution of the bootstrap program].

24. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Fullam and Devereux before him at the time the invention was made, to modify the integrated processor system taught by Fullam to include the teachings of Devereux, in order to obtain the claimed integrated processor system. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated

to make such a combination as it provides speed benefits without data corruption [Devereux: col.7, ll.36-49].

25. Claims 9 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fullam as applied to claims 3 and 14 above, and further in view of Little et al., US Patent 6272637, hereinafter Little.

26. In re claims 9 and 19, Fullam taught each and every limitation of the claim, as discussed above in reference to claim 3. Fullam discloses wherein the processing unit executes at least a portion of the bootstrap program to store the memory setup data in the memory interface [54 part of 56] [col.1, ll.25-50; col.7, l.38 – col.8, l.19]. Fullam did not disclose explicitly loading additional programs for execution into external memory.

27. Little discloses an integrated processor system [fig.3] wherein the processing unit loads additional programs for execution into external memory [130] [col.5, ll.39-51].

28. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Fullam and Little before him at the time the invention was made, to modify the integrated processor system taught by Fullam to include the teachings of Little, in order to obtain the claimed integrated processor system. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to make such a combination as it provides secured processing of information [Little: col.1, ll.39-59].

Response to Arguments

29. Applicant's arguments filed February 7, 2007 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

30. Applicant argues that Fullam "doesn't teach an integrated processor without general purpose random access memory". Examiner respectfully submits that this feature was not disclosed in the original specification, as discussed above. Although Fullam does not appear to disclose the integrated processor of claim 7, Fullam does disclose executing a bootstrap program with an integrated random access memory [col.1, ll.31-32; col.6, l.59; e.g., cache], just as the claimed invention does with the buffer and cache memory.

31. Applicant argues that Fullam "does not teach execution of the bootstrap program to determine memory set-up data before being able to write to the external memory". Examiner disagrees as Fullam did not discuss writing data to the external memory [58] [col.7, ll.39-55; embodiment was focused on reading the configuration data from a separate non-volatile device in order to access the external memory].

32. Applicant argues that Fullam does not disclose "a network interface and obtaining memory setup data through the network... requires the execution of a sophisticated network protocol..." Examiner submits that limitations involving the "sophisticated network protocol" were not claimed.

33. As such, Applicant's argument are deemed not persuasive and the rejections are respectfully maintained.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Tse Chen whose telephone number is (571) 272-3672. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday 9AM - 5PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Rehana Perveen can be reached on (571) 272-3676. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.



Tse Chen
March 27, 2007